



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,752	04/30/2001	Brian T. Murren	GE1-002US	3457

21718 7590 02/15/2005

LEE & HAYES PLLC
SUITE 500
421 W RIVERSIDE
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">09/845,752</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">MURREN ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Mohammad A Siddiqi</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2154</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah et al. (6,742,015) (hereinafter Bowman-Amuah).

4. As per claim 1, Bowman-Amuah discloses a server system, comprising:

one or more computers (fig 10, col 27, lines 5-20); and

an application executing on the computers to handle client requests,

the application comprising (col 27, lines 35-45):

a business logic layer to process (fig 10, col 123, lines 60-67, col 124, lines 1-6) the client requests according to a particular business domain and produce replies to be returned to the clients in response to the client requests (fig 10, col 122, lines 1-14); and

a presentation layer separate from, but in communication with (fig 10, col 50, lines 50-67), the business logic layer to structure the replies in a manner that makes the replies presentable on different types of client devices (thin client, fat clients, fig 10, col 32, lines 45-63, col 27, lines 5-21).

5. As per claim 2, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the application is reconfigurable to other business domains by substituting other business logic layers that are designed to process the client requests according to the other business domains (col 125, lines 25-30, col 127, lines 54-67).

6. As per claims 3 and 13, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the presentation layer is configured to determine a layout of content in the replies (fig 10 and 13, col 40, lines 35-44).

7. As per claims 4 and 14, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the presentation layer is configured to determine display attributes in the replies (col 40, lines 45-67).

8. As per claims 5 and 15, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the different types of client devices support different data formats, the presentation layer being configured to select appropriate data formats for encoding the replies (col 32, lines 45-67).

9. As per claims 6 and 16, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the different types of client devices support different communication protocols, the presentation layer being configured to select appropriate communication protocols for delivering the replies to the clients (col 37, lines 54-63).

10. As per claims 7 and 26, Bowman-Amuah discloses, wherein the presentation layer is configured to determine how to display the replies for a particular client (col 32, lines 45-67).

11. As per claim 8, Bowman-Amuah discloses, wherein the presentation layer comprises: a presentation tier to determine how the replies will appear on the client devices to users (fig 111 and 124, col 249, lines 19-28); and

a rendering tier, separate from the presentation tier, to determine how to render the replies on the client devices (fig 111 and 124, col 249, lines 19-28, lines 57-66).

12. As per claims 9 and 23, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the presentation layer comprises:

a tag library containing pre-constructed tags for a variety of data formats (fig 10, col 40,24-67, col 41, lines 1-9); and

a request dispatcher to structure a reply for service back to a client device, the request dispatcher being configured to access the tag library to obtain tags to structure the reply according to a particular data format (fig 124, col 40,41, col 249, lines 19-28).

13. As per claims 10 and 25, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the request dispatcher is configured to select a communication protocol to be used to serve the reply back to the client device (fig 10, col 57, lines 55-57,col 249-250).

14. As per claim 11, Bowman-Amuah discloses, wherein the presentation layer further comprises a content renderer to conform the reply structured by the request dispatcher to output capabilities of the client device

to which the reply will be returned (col 249-151).

15. As per claim 12, Bowman-Amuah discloses in a server application that receives client requests for a problem domain and has at least one problem solving module to generate replies to be served back to clients, a presentation module separate from the problem solving module, comprising (fig 10 -13, col 31, lines 50-60):

a presentation component to construct how a reply will appear (fig 10, col 34 lines 60-67, col 31, lines 50-60); and

a rendering component to configure how the reply is output on a particular client (fig 10, col 33, lines 59-65,col 31, lines 50-60).

16. As per claim 17, Bowman-Amuah discloses, wherein the rendering component is configured to conform the reply to a specific display at the particular client (fig 10, col 32, lines 45-67 col 33, lines 59-65,col 31, lines 50-60).

17. As per claim 18, Bowman-Amuah discloses a computer software architecture embodied on one or more computer-readable media (fig 10 -13, col 31, lines 50-60), comprising:

a presentation tier to determine how data for communication to a client device is to be presented on a the client device (fig 10, col 34 lines 60-67, col 31, lines 50-60); and

a rendering tier, separate from the presentation tier, to determine how to render the data on the client device (fig 10, col 33, lines 59-65,col 31, lines 50-60).

18. As per claims 19 and 30, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the presentation tier (fig 10, col 41-42) is configured to determine at least one of (1) a layout of the data (col 38-50), (2) a color scheme in which to present the data (col 99,lines 61-67), (3) a presentation theme (col 40-42), and (4) a particular skin appearance (col 40-42, col 99, lines 62-67).

19. As per claims 20,28, and 29, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the presentation tier is configured to select a data encoding format for encoding the data and a communications protocol in which to send the data to the client device (col 72, lines 20-25, col 40-42).

20. As per claim 21, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the presentation tier comprises multiple dispatchers, each dispatcher being configured to

encode the data according to a particular encoding format (fig 10, col 249, lines 19-21, col 72, lines 20-25, col 40-42).

21. As per claim 22, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the presentation tier comprises multiple dispatchers, each dispatcher being configured to package the data according to a particular communications protocol (fig 10 and 124, col 249-250, col 72, lines 20-25).

22. As per claim 24, Bowman-Amuah discloses a tag library containing pre-constructed tags for a variety of data formats (col 40, lines 24-67, col 41, lines 1-9);

multiple request dispatchers to structure replies to be returned to client devices in response to requests submitted by the client devices, individual request dispatcher formatting data according to particular formats that are supported by the client devices protocol (fig 10 and 124, col 249-250, col 72, lines 20-25); and

content renderer to conform the replies to output capabilities of the client devices to which the replies are to be returned (fig 10 and 124, col 33, lines 59-65, col 31, lines 50-60, col 249-250, col 72, lines 20-25).

23. As per claim 27, Bowman-Amuah discloses

receiving a reply generated by a server application in response to a client request; structuring the reply to define how the reply will appear when communicated to and presented at the client (fig 10 and 124, col 33, lines 59-65,col 31, lines 50-60, col 249-250, col 72, lines 20-25); and

independent of said structuring, conforming the reply to output capabilities of the client (fig 10 and 124, col 33, lines 59-65,col 31, lines 50-60, col 249-250, col 72, lines 20-25).

24. As per claim 31, Bowman-Amuah discloses further comprising: storing pre-constructed tags that can be used to construct the reply in different formats; and selecting at least one of the tags when structuring the reply (fig 124, col 40,41, col 249, lines 19-28).

25. As per claim 32, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the configuring comprises sizing the reply for a display at the client (col 227, lines 10-16).

26. As per claim 33, Bowman-Amuah discloses one or more computer-readable media comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed, direct an application server to:

generate replies in response to client requests, the client requests

being submitted by diverse client devices that support different data formats and different communication protocols (fig 10 and 124, col 33, lines 59-65, col 31, lines 50-60, col 249-250, col 72, lines 20-25); and

structure the replies to define how the replies will appear when communicated to presented on the client devices and independently form individual replies for output capabilities of the client devices so that the replies are encoded format (fig 10, col 249, lines 19-21, col 72, lines 20-25, col 40-42) to comply with the data formats supported by the client devices and are sent using the communication protocols of the client devices (fig 10 and 124, col 33, lines 59-65, col 31, lines 50-60, col 249-250, col 72, lines 20-25).

27. As per claim 34, Bowman-Amuah discloses further comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed, direct an application server to use pre-constructed tags to structure the replies (fig 124, col 40,41, col 249, lines 19-28).

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed 11/03/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore, the rejection to claims 1-34 is maintained.

29. In the remarks, applicant argued that:

A. Claim 1, Bowman-Amuah does not disclose, teach or suggest execution of the presentation logic in server

B. Claim 2-11, Neither this referenced portion, nor the other referenced portion cited by the Office disclose, teach or suggest "wherein the different types of client the different types of client devices support different data formats, the presentation layer being configured to select appropriate data formats for encoding the replies"

C. wherein the different types of client devices support different communication protocols, the presentation layer being configured to select appropriate communication protocols for delivering the replies to the clients", which is not disclosed, taught or suggest by Bowman-Amuah.

D. Claim 12, Recites in server application

E. Claim 16 recites "wherein the clients support different communication protocols, the presentation component being

configured to select an appropriate communication protocol for delivering the reply to the particular client." (emphasis added).

The presentation logic of Bowman-Amuah, however, is limited to execution on the client.

F. For example, Claim 22 recites "wherein the presentation tier comprises multiple dispatchers, each dispatcher being configured to package the data according to a particular communications protocol" which is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Bowman-Amuah.

G. Claim 24 recites an architecture comprising tag library containing pre-constructed tags for a variety of data formats "multiple request dispatchers to structure replies to be returned to client devices in response to requests submitted by the client devices, individual request dispatcher formatting data according to particular formats that are supported by the client devices" content renderer to conform the replies to output capabilities of the client devices to which the replies are to be returned". these aspects. Bowman-Amuah does not disclose, teach or suggest.

30. In response to argument item 29 (A, C and D), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Bowman-Amuah discloses a presentation layer separate from (presentation and business logic are loosely coupled, elements fig 122, col 248, lines 6-10), but in communication with (web server is in communication with organization application, application includes business logic, col 44, lines 63-67 and col 45, lines 1-5, col 107, lines 22-67), the business logic layer to structure the replies in a manner that makes the replies presentable on different types of client devices (elements, fig 124, thin client, browser, runs on different devices, fat clients, fig 10, col 32, lines 45-63, col 27, lines 5-21).

31. In response to argument 29(B), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Bowman-Amuah discloses the different types of client the different types of client devices (elements, fig 124) support different data formats, the presentation layer being configured to select appropriate data formats for encoding the replies (elements, 123, col 249, lines 19-46, this further accomplished by user interface validation)

32. In response to argument 29(E-G), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Bowman-Amuah discloses, user interface validator (col 250, lines 35-46) and

validation rules for multiple device communicates using different protocols outputting different format (fig 122-127, col's 247-252).

Conclusion

33. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100